

**REMARKS**

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the personal interview of October 19, 2005. The undersigned agrees that the Examiner Interview Summary accurately reflects the discussion of pending claims 1, 10 and 14 and the language of “directly” connects.

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Hollstrom (U.S.P. 6,673,247). Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejection.

Claim 1 describes a printing method in which a portable communications terminal is directly connected to a printer. In making the rejection, the Examiner relies upon Figs. 1 and 2 in an inconsistent manner such that the rejection must be withdrawn. Specifically, in reference to Fig. 1, the Examiner cites the portable phone 1 which is connectable via a wireless (Bluetooth - col. 4, lines 25-26) link to a printer 30. The Examiner then refers to Fig. 2, which describes an RS 232 connector in relation to a driver 260 and connector 16. However, connector 16 does not connect to the printer (See Fig. 1) but rather connects to a non-printing device. Rather, a wireless interface 17 has no direct connection with the printer. The Examiner’s reliance on the RS 232 connector is not appropriate because it links the phone with an element other than a printer. Applicant submits that connection through the various protocols and interfaces required by Hollstrom would not correspond to a terminal directly connected to the printer as described

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/803,738

by claim 1. Applicant also submits that connection via a wire does not comprise a direct connection.

In order for the Examiner to maintain an anticipation rejection, the art of record must teach each and every claim feature either implicitly or explicitly. During the course of the interview, it is submitted that the Examiner referred to “the understanding of one skilled in the art as suggested by the teachings of Hollstrom” to support the anticipation rejection. The suggestions of the art may be pertinent to an obviousness rejection, but do not sustain an anticipation rejection as presently stated. Therefore, Hollstrom does not anticipate claim 1 for at least these reasons.

Because claim 6 includes analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features of claim 1, claim 6 is also patentable for the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 7-12 are patentable based on their dependency.

With further regard to claim 10, this claim describes a light-emission head that exposes an instant print film and a spread device to spread developer in the instant print film. The Examiner contends that this is inherently included in Hollstrom and relies on col. 4 to teach this aspect of claim 10. Col. 4 of Hollstrom merely teaches the various forms of intercommunication that occur between the phone, camera, and printer, for example. Printing need not occur via an instant film using the spreader and developer described by claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable for this additional reason.

Because claim 13 includes an analogous recitation as described to 10 above, claim 13 is patentable for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 14 describes alternative sources for the image data, such as from a camera of the portable terminal or another apparatus, and the image data stored in the portable communication device are output to printer. The Examiner has not indicated how Hollstrom teaches this aspect of claim 14, or the additional features of the print information such as a number of prints, zooming information, timing, brightness and chromaticity. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable for these additional reasons.

Similarly, with regard to claim 15, the Examiner has not rebutted the arguments of record for patentability and has failed to indicate where Hollstrom teaches a communicating device that transmits and receives image data of an image. Moreover because claim 15 includes a first connecting device and outputting device to connect the communication terminal to the printer via the output device and the first connecting device, this is not consistent with the Examiner's prior reliance on Hollstrom to teach the "direct" connection of a printer and communication terminal as described by claim 1. Therefore, at a minimum, the rejection of either claim 1 or claim 15 should be withdrawn.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/803,738

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

 # 40,766

  
Susan Perng Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 28, 2005